



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/561,709	12/21/2005	Achim Kraus	081276-1081-00	8170		
23409	7590	09/23/2010	EXAMINER			
MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH LLP 100 E WISCONSIN AVENUE Suite 3300 MILWAUKEE, WI 53202				GRAHAM, GARY K		
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER				
3727						
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE				
09/23/2010		PAPER				

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b><i>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</i></b>	<b>Application No.</b> <i>10/561,709</i>	<b>Applicant(s)</b> <i>KRAUS ET AL.</i>
	<b>Examiner</b> <i>Gary K. Graham</i>	<b>Art Unit</b> <i>3727</i>

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 08 September 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
 5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 112 first paragraph.  
 6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
 7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: 17.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-3, 5, 6, 10, 12 and 13.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
 9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
 10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
Applicant's argument that Muehlpforte does not suggest a clip is noted but not persuasive. Applicant argues that a clip is not annular and that such is understood by those skilled in the art. Such is not persuasive. Applicant's basis for clips being limited to some non-annular shape is queried. As far as can be determined by the Examiner, clips can be embodied in a wide variety of shapes, including annular. Applicant goes on to argue that a clip has a different function than a ring or nut. Indeed, the function of a clip is to grip or hold things together. The Muehlpfort element clearly functions as such to hold the bearing in the support, clearly meeting the clip function. Applicant's argument that neither Muehlpforte or Lisiecki suggest a clip detachably connecting the bearing to the support such that the bearing separates from the support in the event of an increased force on the wiper shaft due to impact with a pedestrian is noted but not persuasive. As set forth in the final, both Muehlpforte and Lisiecki disclose clips that detachably connect the bearing to the support. The desired functionality of the clip does not act to distinguish and is not deemed to impart any particular structure to the clip that would define over Muehlpforte or Lisiecki, especially when the application of sufficient force (magnitude, direction, duration) would appear to detach the clips of Muehlpforte or Lisiecki. While applicant sets forth that forces involved in an impact with a pedestrian are well known, such has not been disclosed and no evidence in support of such has been provided.  
 12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  
 13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Gary K Graham/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3727